Reserve

G.R.S. IX—5]

Previous references

1922.
Mugrai)

File No. 87-22

Serial Nos. 1-7

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 5

Part B for April 23

SUBJECT

Archakship of Basavanna temple at Gangenapur Sober Hobli Nagadi Tk

To The Mugrai Commissioner

No 2650 912-4-23

87

forwards the records for a fresh

[illegible] after giving the [illegible] appellant

[illegible] hearing heard

Printed on the Multigraph.

F. R. S. 11] 1922.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inwards)

NOTES.

File No 87-22

FILE HEADING.

Archakship of Basavanna temple at Gangenapura, Sirur Holli, Mapedi Taluk

From

Muchinaiyya Son of Lingappa, Gangenapura.

No. Petition Dated , Received 8. 8. 22

Diary No.	Enclos 3 Spare Copies -	Serial No.
607		

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the Dy. C... order appointing the respondent Vappatiah as Pujari of the temple, and prays for a stay order pending disposal of this appeal petition.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The petition is duly stamped. The Dy. Comrs. order sanctioned is dated 8.7.1922 while the appeal petition was presented on 8.8.1922.

2. In his Memo no. 595, (instant date) on a perusal

G. R. S III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. S [illegible] of 19[illegible]

Serial No

inspection, The Sub Divl Officer has appointed the respondent Vappathiah as Archaka, & he has found competent for the place. 3 The Dy. Cmr has rejected the appeal of the claimants and has directed the Sub Divl Officer to carry out his order, as he failed to [illegible] the Divl Officer [illegible]

I
Cmr's Dy 8.7.22

[illegible]

5 The petn marked A & the appellant's order appealed against were perused
10/8/22

6 The endorsement may be treated as the d.o order.
7 Records may be called for. There are no reasons for stay of execution.
Final Memo
U.J 12/8/22

1525-40.
16.8.22.

8. Cannot this be remanded to the S.C. for enquiry & disposal on its merits? D.S.C.

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

Rejected the appeal on a technical point only?

Rec
19.8.22.

9.

21/8/22

10. The order of the Dy Commr cannot be set aside without notice to the respondent and giving him an opportunity of having his say.

11. A remand necessary unless a reversal of the order appealed against.

12. If respondent is to be heard, it would be better to have the record

2415-131
23.9.22.

First Member 25/8/22

13. The records may be called for

Rec
24-9-22 24/9/22

25/9

Issue
26-9-22. 27/9/22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R S III-2j

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No of 19

Serial No

Ans

of

of

on the petn. /s

17 The said Ld. Assistant

18 Sub. He has produced none -

20/11/22

19 Please see the second line of the case wherein note on the first page.

20 Sub. It was noted that no evid[ence] was produced

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mus File No. 87 of 1922

Serial No.

with the petn under disposal. The endts produced with the 1st appe & petn & have been sent to the Mus: Govt with the letter calling for a report.

21 So, the endt on the petn may be approved or the petn may be forwarded to the Mus: Govt in continuation.

SD
21/11/22

22 Records have been called for in connection with this appeal but they have not come. In the meantime appellant prays for a stay order but there do not seem to be any grounds for the issue of such an order.

Head Moharir) 24/11/22

23

4363-745 / 25.11.22

Petn may be forwarded to the M.P. in contn

Pleader 27.11.22

27/11/22

N.V. for Staff 28/11

24

D.O.K. Solanki

AG 28.11.22

SD 28/11/22

25 Dossier

27/11/22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat

Inz File No. 87 of 1922

Serial No.	
4	Dr [illegible] Mur. Comm. [illegible] Requests [illegible] Subr. of his report [illegible]
5.	From, The Inz Comr. Letter no C 332 Dy 10-1-23. Submits the report called for in Sl. 4. On the appeal petition of Kuchcraiya.
6.	1) The Dy. Comr ends rejecting the appeal of Kuchcraiya, is flaffe. The reasons for rejecting the appeal are noted on the back in memo prepared in the Dy Comr's office.
7	2) The record now said belongs to the Dy. Comrs. office leading to the ends refd to, and if it is decided to hear the parties before passing orders, the Talukdar and Sub Divl. Office records having on the case, will, if found necessary, [illegible] be called for.
	Submitted for orders. [illegible]
	2). The Dy Comr rejected 15-1-23 the appellants appeal on the ground that he did not produce the sub Divl Offr's

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mug File No. 87 of 1922

Serial No.

order appealed against for a number of months. He could not go into merits of the case. This may if approved be remanded to the Mug Comr. for going into the merits of the case and disposal of the same, leaving the aggrieved party's appeal to go if need be.

RG 16/1/23

Was the Resp. Ld. Dist. Comr. either hearing Appellant or giving notice to him?

16/1/23

16.1.23

3rd The record connected with the order of the Sub Divl officer case has been received. May the Sub Divl office and Taluk office records be called for. A copy of the Sub Divl officer's order has been filed with the appeal petition but it does not give information on the point.

Submitted.

RG 17-1-23 - 17/1/23

17/1/23

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

20/1

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Inuz File No. 87 of 1922

Serial No.

DC Srikurd
RR
22-1-1884
22/1/23

5- No. 2160 Dj 28/1/23 to the Asst. Commr.
Requests to send the connected records with his orders & F.O.s & the Amildar.

Sec 6 From, the Inuz. Comm.
Letter no. C. 332 Dj 24.3.1923.
Submits the records called for in Sl. 5.

3(a) The order of the Sub Divl officer is flagged.

3(b) In his hukum Dj 26-3-18, the Sub Divl officer has directed that when he encamps in Salsette, the file might be put up with all the parties concerned. Here are notices the hukums of the Amildar & the Shekdar directing that the parties should appear before the Sub Divl officer

Dj 16.6.1918 and 25-6-1918 P.Q

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

J. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 57 of 1922

Serial No

One Huchuranna [illegible]
These notices before the [illegible]
Perhaps the appellant Huchuranna
is before first a different
person the Sub Asst officer
says that [illegible]
made in those parts.

The appellant complains that
the Sub Asst officer passed
order without issuing notice
to him or to his father without
hearing any hearing.

May the case be posted
for hearing?

Silver for orders

28.3.1923 28/3/23

Waited upon the
Case being

The facts of the case are
noted below:—

Gangenapura is a Jadi
village in the Nagadi Talua
belonging to Sri Sriagangana-
math. There is a Basaivana
temple in the village and a
Tank. Sri's endowed with

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

Land. It is reported that a Muddaiya was the Archak of the temple who died in the famine of 1875-6 and even since, the temple fell into ruins - one Nanjaiyya was cultivating the land and it is said that the applt is Nanjaiyya's grand-son.

In 1902 and 1905, the dilapidated condition of the temple building was noticed by the local revenue officers who directed the attachment of the land. The temple building was renovated at a cost of ~~Rs~~ 225, out of which half the amount was paid by Nanjaiyya and the other half contributed by the villagers.

(Bruce's Report No. 354 dd 11. 11. 1910).

It is also reported that Nanjaiyya has been conducting puja for the past 30 years recently.

As Nanjaiyya was not in good terms with the villagers, and was not a jangama with

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 87 of 19

Serial No.

Diksha who alone [illegible] caused puja, the villagers complained against Ranjaiyya, continuing to do worship, under Builder's order. The matter came up before the Dy. Com^r who cancelled the Builder's order appointing Ranjaiyya who has [illegible] and entrusted [illegible] and directed that as the original has left no heirs, one Heera Competent Mehta may be appointed. The Sub Divl. officer has appointed one Vappathiala a Janguma as Pujari.

Against this order, Huchiraiyya's grandson Ranjaiyya (Huchiraiyya's father is blind) appealed to the Dy. Com^r and the Dy. Com^r has rejected his appeal as he failed to file a copy of the order appealed against within the stipulated time.

He has appealed to this Court and complains that he has

J

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. of 19

Serial No

orders were passed by Court notice to him or to his pleader and without causing hearing

Submitted.

Sd/- 7/4/23

Clerk to show that affidavit was signed before orders were passed. The matter may be remitted for a fresh decision after hearing appellant.

(First Member) 11/4

8140.167
6.4.23

A. approved.

Sd/-
9.4.23

AS 914

D/F. Submitted.

Sd/- 10-4-23.

10/4/23

7 No 2680 dt 12/4/23 to the Pub. Comm.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. of 19

Serial No.

17

To the records for a fresh decision after giving the appellant an opportunity of being heard.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

Section Misc

File No.

Serial No. 2

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* *191* .

No. 1432 file

To

Date of issue 7.10.22

The Inspector Gen.

Signed by M.T.E.J Anjar

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for favour of report in the accompanied petition dated 6th from Kachchhaigya Sau [illegible] Bhuj.

over.

as Pujari of Basavanna is
known in the village.

I have etc.

U/27/12

Asst. Rai - [illegible]

BA
26.9.12

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

Muz 4]

SUBJECT ....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, *the* 192

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No.

Date of issue 2-12-22

Signed by J. Jeyaraman

To

The Inspr. Comr.,

Sir,

In contn. of this office letter No. 14232 — Muz. 84-1922 Dt. 7-10-22 calling for a report on the petition of Gangaram Kovil Palaki, in T.C. ...

over.

respt Vappahiah as
Pujari of Basavanna
temple in the village,
I am directed to forward
herewith petition regd.
no. 1169 Dy 16-11-1922
from the Sub Divisional
on the same subject,
and to request that the
Submission of the report called for
may be expedited.

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563– GPB—2,500—27-7-22

C 332 of 22-23
Encl one file

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Dated, Pangalore, the 9th January 1923.

27058

From

K.R. Srinivasiengar, Esq., M.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

T.E. Jayarama Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department.

Sir,

Referring to your letter No.1432/Muz. 87-22-2 dated the 7th October 1922 forwarding for report, with records, petition of Huchiraiya, son of Erappa, Gangenapura village, Magadi Taluk, in re the appointment of Vappathiah as Pujari of Basavanna temple in the village, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.O.C.1158 of 22-23 dated 26th December 1922 together with its enclosures. The Deputy Commissioner's order says that Hutcheeriah's petition to him was dismissed for non-presentation of the copy of the Sub Division Officer's order and the latter's order held in abeyance given effect to.

2. The petition received with your letter No.1840 dated the 2nd December 1922 is returned herewith.

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

D.N.

Letter No.O.C.1158 of 22-23 dated 26th December 1922 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, to the Muzrai Commissioner:-

---

"With reference to your letter No.C.332 of 22-23 dated 16th October 1922, calling for the records in Muzrai appeal No.4 of 21-22 on the file of this office, I have the honor to submit herewith the said records and to state that the circumstances under which the -- appeal was dismissed are clearly explained in this office order -- enclosed in the records.

The appeal petition with its enclosures is herewith returned."

"Copy".

for Muzrai Commissioner. 9.1.'23.

D.N.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT..... . ....

....

....

Diary No. of letter replied to——————

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 191 .

Date of issue 29. 1. 23

Signed by M.T.E.J Pinto

Section Mwr

File No. 87-12

Serial No 5

No. 2160

Two files

To

The Muzrai Comr

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no. C 332 Dj 10-1 1923 reporting on the appeal petition of Hachimaiyya of Gangenapura in the Nagadi Taluka re the appointment of Vappathiah as Pujari of Basavanna temple in the Village, Nirchal &c.

over.

You will be so good as forward for reference the records connected with the orders of the Sub Dist. Officer and the Sabha Amildar.

(2) The records now received are herewith returned for ref- & re- Sabha

Thanks.

Ulhas/1/23

Asst. Rao-Vesharg.

B.b.
24/1/23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

34356

27 MAR 1923 SECRETARIAT MUZRAI

3332 of 22-23 Br. archive

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Dated, Bangalore, the 23rd March 1923.

From

K. Chandy, Esquire, B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

87-22-5

To

26 MAR 1923

T.E. Jayarama Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

As desired in your letter No. 2160/Muz. 87-22-5 dated the 29th January 1923, I have the honor to forward herewith the records pertaining to the orders of the Sub Division Office and the Amildar in re the appointment of Vappathiah as Pujari of the Basavanna temple in Gangenapura, Magadi Taluk, received with the Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner's No.O.C.1158 of the 19th instant.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K Chandy

Muzrai Commissioner.

D.N.

Muz 4]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the *192* .

Date of issue 12-4-23

Signed by M.T.E.J. Arigesan,

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. 2680

Two files with papers

To

The Muz. Comm.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith two files with papers relating to correspondence ending with your letter No. C. 332 dt. 24th March 1923 re the appointment of Vaippathiyar as Pujari of Basavanna temple in Gangavathi magani. Please

over.

am directed to observe that there is nothing clearly shown that the appellant Hudiraiyyai son of Erappa was heard before orders were passed. I am accordingly to remit the matter for a fresh decision after giving the appellant an opportunity of being heard (2) the reasons are hereinto referred

List of enclosures.

I have &c.

Sd/ Rec. Secretary

Copied by

Examined by

10/4/23

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7 22